UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,578	01/31/2007	**Eckehard Reinwald**	2003P01783WOUS	5642

46726 7590 01/22/2009
BSH HOME APPLIANCES CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
100 BOSCH BOULEVARD
NEW BERN, NC 28562

EXAMINER	
OSTERHOUT, BENJAMIN LEE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
4132	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
01/22/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/580,578	REINWALD, ECKEHARD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BENJAMIN OSTERHOUT	4132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *9-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 May 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20060525*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 17 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities: the linking "and" after the penultimate element's semicolon but before the last claim element is missing. Appropriate correction is required.

2. Claims 18 and 24 are objected to because of the following informalities: a claim must end with a period not a semicolon. Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claims 22 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "radially outwardly" should be corrected to "radially outward" to be grammatically correct. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Regarding claim 15, claim 15 recites the limitation "the cover" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The term cover may refer to two separate covers and therefore applicant has not clearly stated which cover the claim language refers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,263,343 to Lee.

3. Lee teaches a washing machine (Fig. 1, part 1; col. 2, ll. 53-55) comprising a laundry tub (water container body, Fig. 1, part 2; col. 2, ll. 58-61) having a rear wall (cylindrical plate, Fig. 1, part 21; col. 3, ll. 1-3) with a first facing surface and a laundry driving system (gear box, Fig. 1, part 5A; col. 2, ll. 61-64) located therein, that can be driven from outside the tub by a disk-shaped drive element (motor, Fig. 1, part 5; col. 2, ll. 61-64) having a second facing surface, the first and second facing surfaces facing one another, wherein at least one of the first and second facing surfaces has a surface structure (projecting ribs, Fig. 1, part 22; col. 3, ll. 1-3) and a cover (insulating panel component, Fig. 1, part 23; col. 3, ll. 34-37) disposed over the surface structure homogenizing the surface structure and providing a substantially flat disc-shaped surface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 10, 17, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,263,343 to Lee in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP07035220A to Masaki.

4. Regarding claim 10, Lee is relied upon as above in claim 9. Lee teaches a washing machine (Fig. 1, part 1; col. 2, ll. 53-55) further comprising a pulley (see Fig. 1, part 5A, the gear box has a pulley) serving as a drive element comprising a rim (Fig. 1, part 5A, the pulley has a rim guiding the belt) which guides the belt. Lee does not teach that the pulley includes a number of spokes connecting the hub to the rim and that the spokes are provided with a cover over the second facing surface having a substantially flat disc-shaped surface.

5. Masaki teaches a pulley (Fig. 1, part 10) with spokes (arm, Fig. 2, part 12) connecting the hub (boss, Fig. 2, part 11) to the rim (Fig. 2, part 13) and that the spokes are provided with a cover (pulley cover, Fig. 1, part 15) having a substantially flat disc-shaped surface aiding in noise reduction (Derwent Abstract, Purpose section, ll. 1-2).

6. Because both Lee and Masaki teach pulleys serving as drive elements, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one pulley for the other to achieve the predictable result of driving the washing machine.

7. Regarding claim 17, Lee teaches a washing machine (Fig. 1, part 1; col. 2, ll. 53-55) comprising a tub (water container body, Fig. 1, part 2; col. 2, ll. 58-61) including a rear wall (cylindrical plate, Fig. 1, part 21; col. 3, ll. 1-3) having a hub (see Fig. 1, near part 5A); a drum (washing tank, Fig.1, part 3; col. 2, ll. 55-58 and 61-64) disposed within the tub and mounted for rotation with respect to the tub; a pulley (see Fig. 1, part 5A, the gear box has a pulley) disposed adjacent the rear wall and driving the drum and having a pulley hub and a rim (Fig. 1, part 5A, the pulley has a hub and a rim guiding the belt). Lee does not teach that the pulley has multiple spokes extending between the pulley hub and rim and a cover mounted on the pulley covering the spokes and providing a substantially flat disc-shaped surface facing the rear wall.

8. Masaki teaches a pulley (Fig. 1, part 10) with multiple spokes (arm, Fig. 2, part 12) connecting the hub (boss, Fig. 2, part 11) to the rim (Fig. 2, part 13) and a cover (pulley cover, Fig. 1, part 15) mounted on the pulley covering the spokes and providing a substantially flat disc-shaped surface aiding in noise reduction (Derwent Abstract, Purpose section, ll. 1-2).

9. Because both Lee and Masaki teach pulleys serving as drive elements, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one pulley for the other to achieve the predictable result of driving the washing machine.

10. Regarding claim 18, Lee teaches a washing machine comprising a shaft (see Fig. 1, attached to part 5A) extending through the hub of the tub and connecting the pulley and the drum to one another (Fig. 1, part 5A), the drum and shaft rotating in response to rotation of the pulley (see Fig. 1, parts 5 and 5A).

11. Regarding claim 20, Lee teaches that the cover may be mounted by the use of an adhesive (adhesive, col. 3, ll. 34-37).

12. Claims 11-14 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,263,343 to Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,700 to Panther et al.

13. Regarding claim 11, Lee is relied upon as above in claim 9. Lee teaches that the tub includes spoke-like reinforcements (ribs, Fig. 1, part 22; col. 3, ll. 1-6) obtained from a meander-shaped folding of the base wall. Lee teaches a cover (insulating panel component, Fig. 1, part 23; col. 3, ll. 34-37) for sound deadening (col. 2, ll. 23-30), but does not teach a substantially flat disc-shaped cover being disposed over the spoke like reinforcements.

14. Panther et al. teaches an acoustical laundry cover (blanket, col. 1, ll. 6-10) that may be dimensioned to the laundry tub (providing a substantially flat disc-shaped cover) in which it fits (col. 3, ll. 66-67; col. 4, ll. 1) in order to reduce sound (col. 1, ll. 6-10).

15. Because both Lee and Panther et al. teach acoustical laundry covers, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one cover for the other to achieve the predictable result of deadening sound coming from the washing machine.

16. Regarding claims 12 and 13, Lee is relied upon as above in claim 9. Lee teaches a cover (insulating panel component, Fig. 1, part 23; col. 3, ll. 34-37) for sound deadening (col. 2, ll. 23-30). Lee does not teach that the cover includes a film or that the film is a highly flexible plastic film.

17. Panther et al. teaches an acoustical laundry cover (blanket, col. 1, ll. 6-10) that may be dimensioned to the laundry tub in which it fits (col. 3, ll. 66-67; col. 4, ll. 1) and the cover may be a flexible plastic (col. 2, ll. 4-8) film (the word film is not defined in the specification of the present application and is therefore interpreted as a thin covering).

18. Because both Lee and Panther et al. teach sound deadening laundry covers, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one cover for the other to achieve the predictable result of deadening sound coming from the washing machine.

19. Regarding claim 14, Lee teaches that the cover may be attached by the use of the mechanical means of pressing the cover into the structure of the washing tub (col. 3, ll. 42-48) thereby creating a pressure fit.

20. Regarding claim 23, Lee teaches a washing machine (Fig. 1, part 1; col. 2, ll. 53-55) comprising a tub (water container body, Fig. 1, part 2; col. 2, ll. 58-61) including a rear wall (cylindrical plate, Fig. 1, part 21; col. 3, ll. 1-3) having a hub (see Fig. 1, near

part 5A), multiple spoke-like reinforcements (ribs, Fig. 1, part 22; col. 3, ll. 1-6) extending radially outwardly from the hub, and cavities (see Fig. 1, adjacent to part 22) formed between the spoke-like reinforcements; a drum (washing tank, Fig.1, part 3; col. 2, ll. 55-58 and 61-64) disposed within the tub and mounted for rotation with respect to the tub; a pulley (see Fig. 1, part 5A, the gear box has a pulley) disposed adjacent the rear wall and driving the drum; a cover (insulating panel component, Fig. 1, part 23; col. 3, ll. 34-37) mounted on the tub. Lee does not teach that the cover is mounted to cover the spoke-like reinforcements of the rear wall and provide a substantially flat disc-shaped surface facing the pulley.

21. Panther et al. teaches an acoustical laundry cover (blanket, col. 1, ll. 6-10) that may be dimensioned to the laundry tub (providing a substantially flat disc-shaped cover and covering the spoke-like reinforcements) in which it fits (col. 3, ll. 66-67; col. 4, ll. 1) in order to reduce sound (col. 1, ll. 6-10).

22. Because both Lee and Panther et al. teach acoustical laundry covers, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one cover for the other to achieve the predictable result of deadening sound coming from the washing machine.

23. Regarding claim 24, Lee teaches a washing machine comprising a shaft (see Fig. 1, attached to part 5A) extending through the hub of the tub and connecting the pulley and the drum to one another (Fig. 1, part 5A), the drum and shaft rotating in response to rotation of the pulley (see Fig. 1, parts 5 and 5A).

24. Regarding claim 25, Lee in view of Panther et al. is relied upon as above in claim 23. Lee does not teach that the cover includes a flexible plastic film material.

25. Panther et al. teaches an acoustical laundry cover (blanket, col. 1, ll. 6-10) that may be dimensioned to the laundry tub in which it fits (col. 3, ll. 66-67; col. 4, ll. 1) and the cover may be a flexible plastic (col. 2, ll. 4-8) film (the word film is not defined in the specification of the present application and is therefore interpreted as a thin covering).

26. Because both Lee and Panther et al. teach sound deadening laundry covers, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one cover for the other to achieve the predictable result of deadening sound coming from the washing machine.

27. Regarding claim 26, Lee also teaches that the cover may be attached to the rear wall (cylindrical plate, Fig. 1, part 21; col. 3, ll. 1-3) by the use of glue (adhesive, col. 3, ll. 34-37).

28. Regarding claim 27, in view of Panther et al. is relied upon as above in claim 23. Lee does not teach that the cover is mounted with a mechanical fastener.

29. Panther et al. teaches that a washing machine may have a (col. 1, ll. 6-10) sound deadening laundry cover (blanket, col. 1, ll. 6-10) with mechanical fasteners (col. 4, ll. 44-49) in order to attach the cover to the washing machine and prevent sagging of the cover (col. 4, ll. 50-57).

30. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the cover of Lee with the mechanical fasteners of Panther et

al. in order to attach the cover to the washing machine and prevent sagging of the cover.

31. Claims 15, 16, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,263,343 to Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,700 to Panther et al. in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP07035220A to Masaki.

32. Regarding claim 15, Lee in view of Panther et al. is relied upon as above in claim 11. Lee teaches a washing machine (Fig. 1, part 1; col. 2, ll. 53-55) further comprising a pulley (see Fig. 1, part 5A, the gear box has a pulley) serving as a drive element comprising a rim (Fig. 1, part 5A, the pulley has a rim guiding the belt) which guides the belt. Lee also teaches that the cover may be attached to the rear wall (cylindrical plate, Fig. 1, part 21; col. 3, ll. 1-3) by the use of glue (adhesive, col. 3, ll. 34-37). Lee teaches a cover (insulating panel component, Fig. 1, part 23; col. 3, ll. 34-37) for sound deadening (col. 2, ll. 23-30). Lee does not teach that the cover includes a film.

33. Panther et al. teaches an acoustical laundry cover (blanket, col. 1, ll. 6-10) that may be dimensioned to the laundry tub in which it fits (col. 3, ll. 66-67; col. 4, ll. 1) and the cover may be a flexible plastic (col. 2, ll. 4-8) film (the word film is not defined in the specification of the present application and is therefore interpreted as a thin covering).

34. Because both Lee and Panther et al. teach sound deadening laundry covers, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one cover for the other to achieve the predictable result of deadening sound coming from the washing machine.

35. Lee in view of Panther et al. does not teach that the pulley includes a number of spokes connecting the hub to the rim, the spokes are provided with a cover over the second facing surface having a substantially flat disc-shaped surface.

36. Masaki teaches a pulley (Fig. 1, part 10) with spokes (arm, Fig. 2, part 12) connecting the hub (boss, Fig. 2, part 11) to the rim (Fig. 2, part 13) and that the spokes are provided with a cover (pulley cover, Fig. 1, part 15) having a substantially flat disc-shaped surface aiding in noise reduction (Derwent Abstract, Purpose section, ll. 1-2).

37. Because both Lee in view of Panther et al. and Masaki teach pulleys serving as drive elements, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one pulley for the other to achieve the predictable result of driving the washing machine.

38. For this claim, the claim language "at least partially glued to at least one of the drive element and to the rear wall" has been construed to mean the drive element and/or to the rear wall because of the at least one of language.

39. Regarding claim 16, Lee in view of Panther et al. and Masaki are relied upon as above in claim 15. Lee in view of Panther et al. and Masaki teaches that the film (defined as a thin covering) is glued (adhesive, col. 3, ll. 34-37) to the spoke-like reinforcements (see Lee, ribs, Fig. 1, part 22; col. 3, ll. 1-3) of the tub (see Lee, col. 3, ll. 34-37; see Panther, col. 2, ll. 4-8)

40. For this claim, the claim language "at least one of the spokes of the drive element and the spoke-like reinforcements of the tub" has been construed to mean one of the

spokes of the drive element and/or to the spoke-like reinforcements of the tub because of the at least one of language.

41. Regarding claim 28, Lee in view of Panther et al. is relied upon as above in claim 23. Lee teaches a washing machine wherein the pulley includes a hub and a rim. Lee does not teach that the pulley includes multiple spokes extending between the pulley hub and rim, the washing machine further comprising a second cover mounted on the pulley covering the spokes and providing a substantially fiat disc-shaped surface facing the rear wall, the cover and second cover being formed from a flexible plastic film material.

42. Panther et al. teaches an acoustical laundry cover (blanket, col. 1, ll. 6-10) that may be a made of a flexible plastic (col. 2, ll. 4-8) film (the word film is not defined in the specification of the present application and is therefore interpreted as a thin covering).

43. Because both Lee and Panther et al. teach sound deadening laundry covers, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one cover for the other to achieve the predictable result of deadening sound coming from the washing machine.

44. Masaki teaches a pulley (Fig. 1, part 10) with multiple spokes (arm, Fig. 2, part 12) connecting the hub (boss, Fig. 2, part 11) to the rim (Fig. 2, part 13) and that the spokes are provided with a cover (pulley cover, Fig. 1, part 15) having a substantially flat disc-shaped surface aiding in noise reduction (Derwent Abstract, Purpose section, ll. 1-2).

45. Because both Lee in view of Panther et al. and Masaki teach pulleys serving as drive elements, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one pulley for the other to achieve the predictable result of driving the washing machine.

46. Claims 19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,263,343 to Lee in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP07035220A to Masaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,700 to Panther et al.

47. Regarding claim 19, Lee in view of Masaki is relied upon as above in claim 17. Lee teaches a cover (insulating panel component, Fig. 1, part 23; col. 3, ll. 34-37) for sound deadening (col. 2, ll. 23-30). Lee in view of Masaki teaches a cover (pulley cover, Fig. 1, part 15) mounted on the pulley covering the spokes and providing a substantially flat disc-shaped surface aiding in noise reduction (Derwent Abstract, Purpose section, ll. 1-2). Lee in view of Masaki does not teach that the cover includes a flexible plastic film material.

48. Panther et al. teaches an acoustical laundry cover (blanket, col. 1, ll. 6-10) that may be dimensioned to the laundry tub in which it fits (col. 3, ll. 66-67; col. 4, ll. 1) and the cover may be a flexible plastic (col. 2, ll. 4-8) film (the word film is not defined in the specification of the present application and is therefore interpreted as a thin covering).

49. Because both Lee in view of Masaki and Panther et al. teach sound deadening covers for pulleys and laundry use, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to substitute one pulley cover for the other to achieve the predictable result of deadening sound coming from the washing machine.

50. Regarding claim 21, Lee in view of Masaki is relied upon as above in claim 17. Lee teaches that the sound deadening cover may be mounted by the use of an adhesive (adhesive, col. 3, ll. 34-37). Lee in view of Masaki does not teach that a mechanical fastener may be used to mount the cover.

51. Panther et al. teaches that a washing machine may have a (col. 1, ll. 6-10) sound deadening laundry cover (blanket, col. 1, ll. 6-10) with mechanical fasteners (col. 4, ll. 44-49) in order to attach the cover to the washing machine and prevent sagging of the cover (col. 4, ll. 50-57).

52. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the cover of Lee in view of Masaki with the mechanical fasteners of Panther et al. in order to attach the cover to the washing machine and prevent sagging of the cover.

53. Regarding claim 22, Lee in view of Masaki is relied upon as above in claim 17. Lee teaches that the rear wall (cylindrical plate, Fig. 1, part 21; col. 3, ll. 1-3) of the tub (water container body, Fig. 1, part 2; col. 2, ll. 58-61) includes multiple spoke-like reinforcements (ribs, Fig. 1, part 22; col. 3, ll. 1-6) extending radially outwardly from the hub and cavities (see Fig. 1, adjacent to part 22) formed between the spoke-like reinforcements, the washing machine comprising a second cover (insulating panel component, Fig. 1, part 23; col. 3, ll. 34-37) mounted on the tub. Lee in view of Masaki

does not teach that the cover for the tub covers the spoke-like reinforcements of the rear wall and providing a substantially flat disc-shaped surface facing the pulley.

54. Panther et al. teaches an acoustical laundry cover (blanket, col. 1, ll. 6-10) that may be dimensioned to the laundry tub (providing a substantially flat disc-shaped cover and covering the spoke-like reinforcements) in which it fits (col. 3, ll. 66-67; col. 4, ll. 1) in order to reduce sound (col. 1, ll. 6-10).

55. Because both Lee in view of Masaki and Panther et al. teach acoustical laundry covers, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one cover for the other to achieve the predictable result of deadening sound coming from the washing machine.

Conclusion

56. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN OSTERHOUT whose telephone number is (571)270-7379. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00am-4:00pm.

57. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Lavilla can be reached on (571)272-1539. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

58. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BLO/

Benjamin L. Osterhout

13 January 2009

/Michael La Villa/
Michael La Villa
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4132
20 January 2009